

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 501

JC 000 425

AUTHOR Taffy, Fred
TITLE Understanding the High School Proficiency Test and the Early Warning Test in Relation to HCCC Enrollment Trends.
INSTITUTION Hudson County Community Coll., Jersey City, NJ. Office of Planning and Institutional Research.
REPORT NO HCCC-OPIR-R-99.18-AR
PUB DATE 1999-08-00
NOTE 11p.
PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aptitude Tests; *Basic Skills; Community Colleges; *Educational Testing; High School Students; High Schools; Program Development; Qualifications; School Holding Power; Standardized Tests; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Early Warning Test NJ; New Jersey; *New Jersey High School Proficiency Test

ABSTRACT

The Grade 11 High School Proficiency Test (HSPT) and the New Jersey Early Warning Test (EWT) are two key standardized tests that indicate academic ability of county high school graduates which colleges will need to address. While HSPT scores for county high school districts reflect a range of competency in reading, math, and writing, the majority of Hudson County Community College (HCCC) students (71%) come from districts (Jersey City, Union City, and Guttenberg/West New York) that in general do not perform well on the three sections of the HSPT. When one considers the weak academic foundation of so many of the college's students, it should come as no surprise that a large number of students must take courses to develop basic math/English skills and that retention is a challenge for the college. The college must keep these results in mind as it projects needed resources to help upcoming, underprepared students make the transition to college readiness. Indeed, over the course of its history, HCCC has committed resources and sponsored a number of programs and initiatives designed to assist students in developing college ready skills. (JA)



HUDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Office of Planning and Institutional Research
26 Journal Square, 14th Floor
Jersey City, New Jersey 07306
(201) 714-2113
Fax (201) 714-7148

Understanding the High School Proficiency Test and the Early Warning Test in Relation to HCCC Enrollment Trends

Fred Taffy
Report 99.18-AR
August 1999

Mark Oromaner, Dean
Planning & Institutional Research

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Taffy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

☐ Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

Understanding the High School Proficiency Test and the Early Warning Test in Relation to HCCC Enrollment Trends

Introduction

This report is intended to serve three purposes: first (through an analysis of the High School Proficiency Test and the Early Warning Test), to help the college understand more clearly the impact of students' primary and secondary academic development on their preparedness for college-level work; second, to provide data for upcoming program reviews, particularly Academic Foundations; and third, to assist the college as it develops a strategic plan.

The information presented here comes from several sources:

1. The New Jersey Department of Education (High School Proficiency Test and Early Warning Test results).
2. Enrollment Data Reports for Fall 1996, 1997, and 1998 (HCCC P&IR Reports 97.01-IDR, 97.16-IDR, and 98.09-IDR respectively).
3. Exploratory Analyses of Recent Graduates of Jersey City and Union City Public High Schools at HCCC (HCCC P&IR reports 99.0-SR and 99.13-SR).

It should be noted that the data from the New Jersey Department of Education were obtained through the department's web site at <http://www.state.nj.us/njded>. The growing availability of information through internet-based sources—as presented in this report—has enormous potential for facilitating institutional and other research at this college as well as at other institutions.

The High School Proficiency Test and the Early Warning Test

A key challenge facing Hudson County Community College is how best to respond to the academic needs of county high school graduates. This response can be determined in part by an understanding of student performance on two key standardized tests: the Grade 11 High School Proficiency Test (HSPT)—an indicator of academic ability that the college can expect to address in the relative short term—and the New Jersey Early Warning Test (EWT)—a similar indicator that can help the college project its response to student needs for the relative long term.

The HSPT and the EWT, administered to students in grades eleven and eight respectively, measure student ability in reading, mathematics, and writing. Students taking the HSPT must pass all three sections as one of the requirements to earn a high school diploma. Students who do not pass all three sections will receive additional instruction and will be retested on the section or sections they did not pass. The total HSPT reading, mathematics, and writing scores are reported as scale scores with a range of 100 to 500. The passing score on each of the three sections is 300. The EWT provides an indicator of students' progress in mastering the skills they will need to pass the HSPT. Scores on the EWT are reported as proficiency levels, with Level I representing clear competence in the skill area, Level II indicating at least minimal competence, and Level III indicating performance below the state minimum level of proficiency. Students scoring in Level II may or may not need remediation, while students scoring in Level III must receive instructional intervention.

Analysis of the HSPT

Reading Section

Table 1 (next page) presents HSPT scores for the fall 1997 and fall 1996 administrations for Hudson County high school districts. For reading, Weehawken, Bayonne, and Secaucus had the highest percent of students passing, with district rates of 84.3%, 84%, and 83.9% respectively. In the same category, Jersey City, Union City, and Hoboken had the lowest percentages of students passing, with rates of 55.5%, 56.5%, and 58.8% respectively. For the entire state, 84.0% of students taking the HSPT passed the reading section.

In terms of mean reading scores, Weehawken, Secaucus, and Bayonne scored highest, with 371.4, 364.5, and 359.7 respectively. Lowest scores were reported for Jersey City (310.4), Union City (312.6), and Hoboken (322.9). Statewide, the mean reading score was 371.3. As noted earlier, for all three sections of the HSPT, the passing score was 300.

Math Section

In the math section of the HSPT, districts with the highest rates of students passing were North Bergen (86.9%), Kearny (86%), and Bayonne (85.6%). Lowest rates were reported by Jersey City (56.0%), Hoboken (65.7%), and West New York (66.5%). Statewide, 85.9% passed the math section.

In terms of mean scores for math, highest scores were reported by Secaucus (379.3), Kearny (377.9), and North Bergen (377.1). Lowest scores were reported by Jersey City (319.7), Union City (331.2), and West New York (335.2). Statewide, the mean math score was 392.3 (passing = 300).

Writing Section

In terms of writing, highest passing rates were reported by Bayonne (88.8%), Secaucus (88.5%), and North Bergen (88%). Lowest rates were reported by Union City (62.7%), Jersey City (65.3%), and West New York (72.7%). For the entire state, 87.9% passed by the writing section.

6

Mean scores for writing included highest results reported by Bayonne (361.1), North Bergen (356.7), and Secaucus (356.2). Lowest scores were reported by Union City (315.7), Jersey City (319.7), and West New York (323.6). Statewide, the mean writing score was 361.3 (passing = 300).

The HSPT and Enrollment Trends for HCCC

The data presented above can provide a significant insight for the college—especially when viewed in conjunction with the college's enrollment trends according to municipality (see below) over the last few years.

| Fall 1996-Fall 1998 Enrollment According to Hudson County Municipality | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| Municipality | 1996 | | 1997 | | 1998 | | 3 Year Avg | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Bayonne | 299 | 7 | 308 | 7 | 316 | 8 | 308 | 7 |
| East Newark | 52 | 1 | 62 | 1 | 74 | 2 | 63 | 2 |
| Gutt/WNY | 428 | 10 | 365 | 9 | 350 | 8 | 381 | 9 |
| Hoboken | 142 | 3 | 129 | 3 | 145 | 3 | 139 | 3 |
| Jersey City | 2023 | 49 | 2084 | 50 | 2056 | 49 | 2054 | 49 |
| Kearny | 97 | 2 | 101 | 2 | 103 | 2 | 100 | 2 |
| North Bergen | 331 | 8 | 353 | 8 | 366 | 9 | 350 | 8 |
| Secaucus | 44 | 1 | 39 | 1 | 27 | 1 | 37 | 1 |
| Union City | 550 | 13 | 537 | 13 | 544 | 13 | 544 | 13 |
| Other | 163 | 4 | 183 | 4 | 193 | 5 | 180 | 4 |
| Totals | 4129 | 100 | 4161 | 100 | 4174 | 100 | 4156 | 100 |

When averaged over 1996-1998, the largest portion of HCCC's enrollment comes from Jersey City, with an average enrollment of 2054 or 49% of the total HCCC population. The second greatest contributor to HCCC enrollment is Union City, with an average of 544 (13%). The college's third largest portion of enrollment comes from Guttenberg/West New York, with an average enrollment of 381 (9%). Municipalities with the smallest average enrollment contribution include Secaucus (n=37; 1%), East Newark (n=63; 2%), and Kearny (n=100; 2%).

A review of the enrollment data in conjunction with the data regarding student performance on the HSPT reveals that, for the most part, the college's primary sources of enrollment are the same municipalities with students who have performed most poorly on the HSPT.

| Top Three Municipalities Ranked According to Student Contribution to HCC | HSPT Pass Rates Ranked According to Three Lowest Performance Levels | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Reading | Math | Writing |
| 1. Jersey City | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2. Union City | 2 | X | 1 |
| 3. Gutt/WNY | X* | 3 (WNY only) | 3 (WNY only) |

*Note: X indicates performance above three lowest levels.

Analysis of the EWT

Reading Section

Table 2 (next page) presents EWT scores for the March 1998 administration for Hudson County school districts. For reading, the three districts with the greatest number of students scoring at Level I (highest competency) were East Newark with 63.2%, Bayonne with 62.5%, and Secaucus with 62.4%. Districts with the lowest number of students scoring at Level I included Union City (31.3%), Jersey City (33.1%), and Harrison (33.7%). For the entire state, 54.3% of students who attempted the reading section scored in Level I.

In terms of mean reading scores, the three highest scoring districts were Bayonne (152.6), Secaucus (152), and Weehawken (150.4). Lowest scores were reported for Jersey City (129.4), Union City (130), and Harrison (132.3). Statewide, the mean reading score was 144.9.

Math Section

In the math section of the EWT, districts with the highest number of students scoring at Level I included North Bergen with 50.4%, Hoboken with 43%, and Secaucus with 42.6%. Districts with the lowest number of students scoring at Level I were Guttenberg (17.7%), Jersey City (21.4%), and Union City (24.5%). For the entire state, 44.3% of students who attempted the math section scored in Level I.

In terms of mean math scores, the three highest scoring districts were North Bergen (149.2), Secaucus (144.1), and Hoboken (142.2). Lowest scores were reported for Jersey City (123.6), Guttenberg (127.4), and Union City (128.5). Statewide the mean math score was 142.0.

Writing Section

For the writing portion of the EWT, North Bergen, Hoboken, and West New York had the largest number of students scoring in Level I, with 68.3%, 66.9%, and 58.2% respectively. Districts with the lowest number of students scoring at Level I were Guttenberg (19.4%), Union City (22.4%), and Weehawken (28.2%). For the entire state, 53.7% of students attempting the writing section scored in Level I.

Districts with the highest mean scores were North Bergen with 168.2, Hoboken with 166.8, and Secaucus with 159.3. Lowest scores were reported for Guttenberg (115.1), Union City (115.2), and Harrison (118.4). Statewide, the mean writing score was 150.1.

The EWT and Enrollment Trends for HCCC

As with the HSPT, those municipalities scoring most poorly—for the most part—on the EWT contribute most highly to the college's enrollment.

| Top Three Municipalities Ranked According to Student Contribution to HCC | EWT Level I Achievement Ranked According to Three Lowest Performance Levels | | |
|--|---|----------------|----------------|
| | Reading | Math | Writing |
| 1. Jersey City | 2 | 2 | X |
| 2. Union City | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 3. Gutt/WNY | X* | 1 (Gutt. only) | 1 (Gutt. only) |

*Note: X indicates performance above three lowest levels.

| A | | C | E | G | H | J | L | N | P | R | T | V | X |
|----|--|--------------|---------|-------------|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|--------------|----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 | Table 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | New Jersey Early Warning Test March 1998 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Results for Hudson County | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | South Hudson | | | | | | West Hudson | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | District Factor Group | Bayonne | Hoboken | Jersey City | E. Newark | Harrison | Kearny | Guttenberg | North Bergen | Secaucus | Union City | Weehawken | W. New York |
| 10 | Reading | B | B | A | A | A | B | B | B | FG | A | B | A |
| 11 | Level III | 2 | 9.9 | 17.9 | 10.5 | 11.6 | 8.8 | 3.2 | 4.8 | 3 | 16.6 | 1.4 | 9.5 |
| 12 | Level II | 35.5 | 44.6 | 49 | 26.3 | 54.7 | 50.9 | 51.6 | 41.1 | 34.7 | 52.2 | 40.8 | 54.9 |
| 13 | Level I | 62.5 | 45.5 | 33.1 | 63.2 | 33.7 | 40.3 | 45.2 | 54.1 | 62.4 | 31.3 | 57.7 | 35.5 |
| 14 | Math | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | Level III | 6.3 | 8.3 | 24.8 | 5.3 | 8.4 | 13.2 | 14.5 | 4.8 | 3 | 15.9 | 8.5 | 10.2 |
| 16 | Level II | 54.2 | 48.8 | 53.8 | 68.4 | 57.9 | 55 | 67.7 | 44.8 | 54.5 | 59.5 | 62 | 55.1 |
| 17 | Level I | 39.5 | 43 | 21.4 | 26.3 | 33.7 | 31.8 | 17.7 | 50.4 | 42.6 | 24.5 | 29.6 | 34.8 |
| 18 | Writing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | Level III | 15.8 | 5.8 | 31.1 | 31.6 | 32.6 | 12.2 | 33.9 | 7.7 | 5 | 34.6 | 11.3 | 10.5 |
| 20 | Level II | 42.7 | 27.3 | 39.9 | 26.3 | 38.9 | 42.5 | 46.8 | 24 | 38.6 | 43 | 60.6 | 31.3 |
| 21 | Level I | 41.6 | 66.9 | 29 | 42.1 | 28.4 | 45.3 | 19.4 | 68.3 | 56.4 | 22.4 | 28.2 | 58.2 |
| 22 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 | Reading Mean Score | 152.6 | 141.2 | 129.4 | 141.5 | 132.3 | 139.2 | 144.9 | 147.6 | 152 | 130 | 150.4 | 136.4 |
| 24 | Math Mean Score | 141.7 | 142.2 | 123.6 | 137.3 | 137.2 | 133.9 | 127.4 | 149.2 | 144.1 | 128.5 | 135.1 | 137 |
| 25 | Writing Mean Score | 145 | 166.8 | 124.1 | 131.5 | 118.4 | 146.6 | 115.1 | 168.2 | 159.3 | 115.2 | 136.8 | 157.5 |
| 26 | Percent Levels I or II | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | 1998 | 79.4 | 81.8 | 57.8 | 57.9 | 62.1 | 76.9 | 62.9 | 88.3 | 93.1 | 58.2 | 83.1 | 80 |
| 28 | 1997 | 86.5 | 78.1 | 58.9 | 88.9 | 72.1 | 75.2 | 72.4 | 87.1 | 90.8 | 65.7 | 85.1 | 71.1 |
| 29 | Percent Level I | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | 1998 | 20.6 | 30.6 | 12.8 | 15.8 | 14.7 | 18.4 | 6.5 | 33.3 | 26.7 | 9.5 | 16.9 | 17 |
| 31 | 1997 | 29.6 | 27.6 | 14.4 | 44.4 | 20.7 | 18.9 | 13.8 | 34.2 | 35.8 | 11 | 13.5 | 11 |

Conclusions

While HSPT scores for county high school districts reflect a range of competency in reading, math, and writing, the majority of HCCC students (71%) come from districts (Jersey City, Union City, and Guttenberg/West New York) that in general do not perform well on the three sections of the HSPT. In essence, this would indicate that a large number of the students from these districts are underprepared for college. This is evidenced, for example, by the five-year average—fall 1994 to fall 1998--placement of 59% of Jersey City high school graduates in Basic Skills/Academic Foundations (AF) courses (remaining students are 35% program/fully degree ready and 6% ESL).

It should be noted that, in a study (Exploratory Analysis of Recent Graduates of Jersey City Public High Schools at HCCC, Report 99.01-SR, January 1999) of three cohorts for fall 1994, fall 1995, and fall 1996, Jersey City high school graduates—when compared with graduates of other New Jersey high schools (mainly Hudson County high schools)—were less likely than students of other New Jersey high schools to be program-ready. HCCC's second largest source of enrollment, Union City, reflects a similar academic placement pattern, with 55% of Union City high school graduates in AF courses (remaining students are 34% program ready and 11% ESL).

When one considers the weak academic foundation of so many of the college's students, it should come as no surprise that:

1. A large number of students must take AF courses.
2. Retention is a challenge for the college, especially in view of the unpreparedness of these students for the rigors of college work.

As mentioned earlier in this report, an understanding of how county students score on the HSPT is important for the college as it develops relatively short-term plans to meet the challenges faced by potential HCCC students from poorly performing districts. However, the college must also be aware of academic trends indicated by the EWT. It would not be unreasonable to assume that districts with poor performance on the EWT will see generally similar results once the same students take the HSPT. Such trends cannot help but impact on the college's longer term planning as it projects resources needed to help upcoming underprepared students make the transition to college readiness.

Indeed, over the course of its history HCCC has committed resources and participated in the sponsorship of a number of programs and initiatives designed to assist students in developing college-ready skills. These include an extensive Academic Foundations/Basic Skills program, college survival skills courses, proficiency testing in early skills courses (e.g., College Composition I), Student Support Services Program (SSSP), and Educational Opportunity (EOF) Fund. Nevertheless, as it is faced with new challenges—distance/online learning, penetrating new markets, and development of new programs—Hudson County Community College must be vigilant about the needs of its current clientele base as it balances those and new needs in the allocation of resources—resources that are generally less than needed and often hard-won.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: <i>UNDERSTANDING THE HIGH SCHOOL PROFICIENCY TEST AND THE EARLY WARNING TEST IN RELATION TO HCCC ENROLLMENT TRENDS</i> | |
| Author(s): <i>FRED TAFFY</i> | |
| Corporate Source: <i>HUDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE</i> | Publication Date: <i>AUGUST 1999</i> |

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.



Check here
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in
microfiche (4" x 6" film) or
other ERIC archival media
(e.g., electronic or optical)
and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be
affixed to all Level 1 documents

| |
|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>Sample</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) |
|---|

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be
affixed to all Level 2 documents



Check here
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in
microfiche (4" x 6" film) or
other ERIC archival media
(e.g., electronic or optical),
but not in paper copy.

| |
|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY <i>Sample</i> TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) |
|---|

Level 2

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign
here→
please

| | |
|--|---|
| Signature: <i>Fred Taffy</i> | Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>FRED TAFFY ASSESSMENT ANALYST</i> |
| Organization/Address: <i>HUDSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE 25 JOURNAL SQUARE JERSEY CITY NJ 07306</i> | Telephone: <i>201-714-7156</i> E-Mail Address: <i>FTAFFY7498@AOL.COM</i> |
| | FAX: <i>201-714-7148</i> Date: <i>5/19/00</i> |

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|------------------------|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|----------|
| Name: |
| Address: |

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

| | |
|---|---|
| Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: | Rika Nakazawa, Acquisitions Coordinator ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges 3051 Moore Hall Box 951521 Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521 |
|---|---|

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: